Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/789,307	WALT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jermie Cozart	3726
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>allowed</u>	
(1) <u>Jermie Cozart</u> .	(3)	
(2) Andrew Heinisch.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 26 January 2006	Time: <u>6:30 pm</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ App Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	licant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 1, 9, 17, 19, and 21		
Prior art documents discussed: none		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	NERAL NATURE OF WHAT WA	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summer 	The examiner will provide a writter record of the substance of the	ten summary of the substance e interview, since the interview
		•
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)		

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: During a telephone conversation with Mr. Heinisch, Mr. Heinisch agreed to amend the specification and claims by examiner's amendment in order to avoid a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph and correct minor defects, in order to place the application in condition for allowance.